

[14 December, 2006]

RAJYA SABHA

### ENACTING FORMULA

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: In the Enacting Formula, there is one amendment No.(2) by the hon. Minister.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Sir, I move:

2. That at page 1, line 1, *for* the word, "Fifty-fifth", the word "Fifty-seventh" be *substituted*.

*The question was put and the motion was adopted.*

*The Enacting Formula, as amended was added to the Bill.*

### LONG TITLE

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: In the Long Title, there is one amendment No.(1) by the hon. Minister.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Sir, I move:

1. That at page 1, in the long title, *for* the word "prevention", the word "prohibition" be *substituted*.

*The question was put and the motion was adopted.*

*The Long Title, as amended, was added to the Bill.*

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

*The Question was put and the motion was adopted.*

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we will take up the Appropriation (No.5) Bill, 2006 and The Appropriation (No.6) Bill, 2006 together.

---

### THE APPROPRIATION (NO.5) BILL, 2006

AND

### THE APPROPRIATION (NO.6) BILL, 2006

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM): Sir, I move:

"That the Bill to provide for the authorisation of appropriation of moneys out of the Consolidated Fund of India to meet the amounts spent on

certain services during the financial year ended on the 31st day of March, 2005, in excess of the amounts granted for those services and for that year, as passed by Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The Appropriation (No.5) Bill, 2006 seeks to provide for appropriation out of the Consolidated Fund of India of the moneys required to meet the expenditure incurred in excess of the appropriations charged on the Consolidated Fund of India and the Grants made by Lok Sabha for the financial year 2004-05. The excess expenditure has been scrutinised by the Public Accounts Committee who have in their Thirty-First Report (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) recommended regularisation of the excess expenditure on 31st March, 2005. Out of the 100 Grants and five Appropriations in 2004-05, excess expenditure occurred in five Grants and one Appropriation.

Sir, I also move:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 2006-07, as passed by Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

4.00 P.M.

This Bill arises out of the Supplementary Appropriations charged on the Consolidated Fund of India and Demands voted by the Lok Sabha. It is proposed to augment the sanctioned provision by Rs.21,823.92 crore. Details of Supplementary Demands are given in the document, which has already been laid on the Table of the House.

However, to the extent of Rs.10,378.64 crore, the augmented provision is matched by savings of the concerned Departments or by enhanced receipts/recoveries. In addition, token provision of Rs.52 lakh is being sought, one lakh for each item of expenditure, for enabling re-appropriation of savings in cases involving New Service or New Instrument of Service. Hence, the net cash outgo involved in the proposals is only Rs.11,444.76 crore. Sir, out of total cash outgo of Rs.11,444.76 crore, an amount of Rs. 10,738 crore, that is 94 per cent of the cash outgo, is in four items. One, transfer to States; two fertilizer subsidy; three, interest relief to farmers; and four, the expenditure in police. The reasons for additional requirements

have been given in the document. I request the House to consider the demands, discuss them and approve.

*The questions were proposed.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, the Motions are open for discussion.

Shri Surendra Lath.

श्री सुरेन्द्र लाठ (उड़ीसा): धन्यवाद उपसभापति महोदय। मैं सरकार के द्वारा विनियोग विधेयक तथा अतिरिक्त मांगों को लेकर जो विधेयक लाया गया है, उस पर बोलने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ।

[उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो० पी० जे० कुरियन) पीठासीन हुए,]

महोदय, यह परम्परा रही है कि प्रत्येक सत्र में विनियोग विधेयक तथा अतिरिक्त मांगों को लेकर जब भी सदन में चर्चा होती है, तो देश के विभिन्न आर्थिक विषयों पर हम इस सदन में आलोचना करते हैं।

महोदय, मैं इस विषय पर बोलते समय सरकार का ध्यान आज की आर्थिक स्थिति की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ। महोदय, देश की 10वीं पंचवर्षीय योजना समाप्ति की ओर है। 11वीं पंचवर्षीय योजना का मसौदा तैयार किया जा रहा है। 2006-07 वर्ष समाप्ति की ओर है और सरकार अगले सत्र में 2007-08 का बजट, आर्थिक संकल्प प्रस्तुत करने जा रही है। देश की आर्थिक स्थिति बहुत अच्छे दौर से गुजर रही है, यह दावा सरकार कर रही है। जी०डी०पी० ग्रोथ 8 से 9 प्रतिशत तक बढ़ रहा है। इसके साथ-साथ देश में चारों ओर औद्योगिक वातावरण बहुत अच्छे ढंग से चल रहा है। किन्तु इस आर्थिक प्रगति का लाभ क्या आम आदमी को मिल रहा है? UPA को सत्ता में आए ढाई साल पूरे हो रहे हैं और इस दौरान देश की आर्थिक प्रगति से देश का आम आदमी कितना लाभान्वित हुआ है, यह जानने की आवश्यकता है। आज भी किसान आत्महत्या कर रहे हैं, लोग भूख से मर रहे हैं, छोटे-छोटे उद्योग बंद हो रहे हैं, बेरोजगारी सुरसा की तरह बढ़ रही है, कुल मिलाकर आज की आर्थिक प्रगति से आम आदमी त्रस्त है। महादेय, जितनी महंगाई इन दो-ढाई वर्षों में बढ़ी है, पिछले 10 सालों में कभी नहीं बढ़ी। महोदय, मुझे यह लगता है कि जब-जब कांग्रेस सत्ता में आती है, महंगाई उनके साथ आती है। लगता यह है कि शायद कांग्रेस और महंगाई का चोली-दामन का साथ है। ... (व्यवधान) ...

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM Have You looked at the figures recently?  
...(Interruptions)

श्री सुरेन्द्र लाठ: पहले मुझे सुन लीजिए, फिर आप बोलिएगा। ... (व्यवधान) ...

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Have you looked at the figures before talking? (Interruptions)

SHRI SURENDRA LATH: Yes, Yes.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: I will reply, but, I hope You have looked at WPI from 1999-2000 to 2006-07. (*Interruptions*) I will give it to you if you want. Please look at that. Please look at those figures and then make a statement.

SHRI SURENDRA LATH: I am talking of the (*Interruptions*)... I am not talking about inflation rate, etc. (*Interruptions*)

महोदय, यह कहा जा रहा है कि कृषि में निवेश को बढ़ाया जा रहा है। कृषि क्षेत्र में किसानों को 7 प्रतिशत ब्याज पर ऋण देने की घोषणा की गई है। बैंक में आज भी कृषि क्षेत्र, कोआपरेटिव सैक्टर को ऋण देने में हम कितना सफल हुए हैं, इस बारे में भी जानने की आवश्यकता है। महोदय, सरकार के कमर्शियल बैंको को किसानों को ऋण देने का जो लक्ष्य दिया गया था, अधिकांश बैंकों ने उसे पूरा नहीं किया, विशेषकर स्टेट बैंक, जो भारत सरकार की सबसे बड़ी बैंकिंग आरगेनाइजेशन है, उसे 20 परसेंट का लक्ष्य दिया गया था, वह इस क्षेत्र में 12-13 प्रतिशत से अधिक का टारगेट पूरा नहीं कर सका है। इसी प्रकार से बाकी के कमर्शियल बैंक भी कृषि ऋण में अपने लक्ष्य को पूरा नहीं कर पाए हैं। सरकार की नीति के अनुसार किसानों को 7 परसेंट पर ऋण उपलब्ध कराने की बात कही गई है। आज हम देखते हैं कि प्रायः 70 प्रतिशत कृषि ऋण कोआपरेटिव बैंक के माध्यम से दिया जाता है और कोआपरेटिव बैंक जो ऋण उपलब्ध कराता है, उसका जो सोर्स है, वह नाबार्ड तथा उनके इंटरनल डिपॉजिट के माध्यम से कराया जा रहा है। महोदय, आज सहकारी बैंक, जो 7 प्रतिशत की ब्याज दर पर ऋण उपलब्ध करा रहे हैं, उनको नुकसान हो रहा है। इस नुकसान की भरपाई केन्द्र सरकार नहीं कर रही है, इसको राज्य सरकारों पर डाला गया है, लेकिन राज्य सरकार इस नुकसान की भरपाई करने में असमर्थ है। इस नुकसान की भरपाई न हो पाने के कारण आज सारे सहकारी बैंक 7 प्रतिशत पर ऋण उपलब्ध कराने में असफल हो रहे हैं। कमर्शियल बैंक जो 7 परसेंट ब्याज पर ऋण दे रहे हैं, उनको तो शायद केन्द्र सरकार कुछ सहायता कर रही है, सब्सिडी भी दे रही है, किन्तु सहकारी बैंको को इसमें किसी प्रकार की सहायता केन्द्र सरकार द्वारा नहीं दी जा रही है। सहकारी बैंकों के माध्यम से अधिकतम किसानों को ऋण दिया जा रहा है और सहकारी बैंक आज बहुत बुरी हालत से गुजर रहे हैं, लेकिन इनको ऊपर उठाने के लिए सरकार किसी प्रकार की प्रोत्साहन योजना नहीं दे रही है। मैं सरकार से आग्रह करूंगा कि सरकार इन सहकारी बैंको को और अधिक सहायता उपलब्ध कराए, जिससे कि सहकारी बैंक अधिक से अधिक लाभ किसानों को दे सकें। मैं सरकार से जानकारी चाहता हूँ कि रिजर्व बैंक आफ इंडिया ने विभिन्न NGOs के नाम से माइक्रो फाइनेंस करने का लाइसेंस देने का निर्णय लिया है। क्या यह सही है कि इसके द्वारा बहुत से सूदखोर व्यवसायी एनजीओ के नाम से किसानों और छोटे-छोटे व्यवसायियों को अधिक सूद में ऋण दे रहे हैं? ये संस्थाएं सर्विस चार्ज के नाम से 20% से 30% तक का सूद वसूल कर रही हैं

और सरकार इन संस्थाओं को मान्यता देने का कार्य कर रही है। अधिकतर एनजीओज़ जो इस प्रकार ऋण देने का कार्य कर रहे हैं, वे ऋण वसूली के लिए अत्याचार भी करते रहे हैं और इसी कारण आज किसान आत्महत्या करने के लिए मजबूर हो रहा है।

महोदय, सरकार ने अभी अपनी नयी आर्थिक नीति में नये आर्थिक ज़ोन बनाने का प्रस्ताव रखा है और इन आर्थिक ज़ोन्स में जो उद्योग स्थापित हो रहे हैं, उन्हें करों में छूट दी जा रही है। जैसा कि बताया गया है, इसके माध्यम से सरकार को एक लाख करोड़ रुपये तक का नुकसान हो रहा है, किन्तु दुर्भाग्य की बात यह है कि किसानों को या कृषि क्षेत्र को, जिस पर इस देश की 60% जनता निर्भर करती है, उसे एक साल में कितनी छूट दी जा रही है?

भारत के जीडीपी या सकल घरेलू उत्पादन में कृषि और किसान का बहुत बड़ा योगदान है। जिस साल किसी कारण से कृषि विफल होती है, उस साल हमारा जीडीपी ग्रोथ भी कम हो जाता है और जिस साल खेती अच्छी हो जाती है, उस साल हमारा जीडीपी ग्रोथ बढ़ जाता है। आज की जीडीपी ग्रोथ बहुत हद तक खेती पर निर्भर करता है, किन्तु यूपीए सरकार कृषि और किसान को प्राथमिकता देने में केवल भाषणों तक ही सीमित है, नीचे तक वह नहीं पहुंच रही है, जिसके कारण कृषि क्षेत्र का ग्रोथ रेट या तो स्थिर है, या कम हो रहा है, वह बढ़ नहीं रहा है। इसी कारण देश में बड़ी मात्रा में खाद्य पदार्थों को ऊंचे दामों पर आयात किया जा रहा है। मुझे आशा है कि इस बातों को अपने आने वाले बजट में ध्यान रखते हुए, वित्त मंत्री जी निश्चित ही कोई महत्वपूर्ण निर्णय लेंगे।

महोदय, भारत की अर्थव्यवस्था के बारे में यहां काफी अच्छे आंकड़े दिए जा रहे हैं। औद्योगिक क्षेत्र में 10% से 12% की वृद्धि हो रही है, टेलीकॉम सैक्टर्स में क्रांति की बात की जा रही है, किन्तु इस सारे विकास का लाभ देश में कितने प्रतिशत लोगों को मिल रहा है, यह सही है कि आज विकास की जो धारा चल रही है, उसके द्वारा बड़ी संख्या में मल्टी-मिलियनर या मल्टी बिलियनर तैयार हो रहे हैं औद्योगिक घरानों की संपत्ति में बेतहाशा वृद्धि हो रही है, किन्तु दुर्भाग्य की बात यह है कि देश का आम आदमी अभी-भी विकास के लाभ से वंचित है। अभी-भी देश के 60% परिवारों तथा कुछ प्रदेशों में तो 80% से 90% परिवारों तक हम बिजली भी नहीं पहुंचा पाए हैं। 60% गावों में पीने का शुद्ध पानी उपलब्ध नहीं है। अधिकांश गावों में स्वास्थ्य की उचित सुविधाएं उपलब्ध नहीं हैं। अभी तक हम सभी लोगों के लिए प्राथमिक शिक्षा उपलब्ध नहीं करा पाए हैं। आज भी देश की 60% खेती योग्य भूमि प्रकृति के ऊपर निर्भर करती है। जहां देश में 70% लोग कृषि पर निर्भर करते हैं, उनका विकास थम सा गया है। आज हजारों की संख्या में किसान

आत्महत्या कर रहे हैं और यह प्रमाणित कर रहे हैं कि देश के विकास का लाभ बहुत सीमित लोगों तक ही पहुंच पा रहा है।

हमारी दसवीं पंचवर्षीय योजना पूरी होने जा रही है और ग्यारहवीं पंचवर्षीय योजना का मसौदा तैयार किया जा रहा है, ऐसे में सरकार को यह तय करना होगा कि आखिर उसकी प्राथमिकताएं क्या हैं? यह दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि देश की स्वाधीनता के 60 वर्ष बाद भी हम देश की प्राथमिकताओं को तय नहीं कर पाए हैं। आज इस देश की प्राथमिकता समाज का वह व्यक्ति है, जो समाज के सबसे निचले पायदान पर खड़ा है, हमें उसका विकास करना है या फिर देश में मल्टी-मिनियनर या मल्टी-बिलियनर तैयार करने हैं, इस बारे में निर्णय लेने की आवश्यकता है मैं सरकार से अनुरोध करता हूँ कि आने वाला जो बजट है या जो 11 वीं पंचवर्षीय योजना बनाने जा रहे हैं उसमें इस बात पर सरकार निश्चित रूप से ध्यान दे। मैं सरकार का ध्यान बेरोजगारी की तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ। महोदय, आज छोटे-छोटे उद्योग जो देश में कृषि के बाद सबसे अधिक रोजगार सृजन करते हैं वे बंद होते जा रहे हैं किन्तु सरकार इन उद्योगों को अभी प्रोत्साहन नहीं दे रही है और जो भी योजनाएं आ रही हैं वे केवल फाइलें और कागजों तक ही सीमित हैं, वे लोगों तक नहीं पहुंच रही हैं। माननीय मंत्री जी घोषणा की थी कि छोटे-छोटे उद्योगों को जो ऋण दिया जाता है उसको दुगुना किया जाएगा। महोदय, अभी इन छोटे-छोटे उद्योगों को ऋण उपलब्धता 7 से 8 प्रतिशत तक मिल रही है, किन्तु छोटे उद्योगों का ग्रोथ 15 से 18 प्रतिशत है और टोटल क्रेडिट फ्लो का ग्रोथ आज 30 प्रतिशत है। अगर हम इन छोटे-छोटे उद्योगों को अधिक बढ़ाना चाहते हैं, इनका विकास करना चाहते हैं तो इनकी ऋण उपलब्धता को 30 प्रतिशत तक बढ़ाना जरूरी है। महोदय, छोटे-छोटे उद्योगों को कम ब्याज की दरों पर ऋण उपलब्ध कराने की आवश्यकता है। विशेषकर इन छोटे-छोटे उद्योगों को 12 से 15 प्रतिशत की दर पर ऋण उपलब्ध हो रहा है, जबकि बड़े बड़े उद्योगों को 6 से 8 प्रतिशत की दर पर ऋण उपलब्ध कराया जा रहा है। आवश्यकता है इन छोटे-छोटे उद्योगों को जो कि बड़ी मात्रा में देश में रोजगार सृजन कर रहे हैं उन्हें 8 से 10 परसेंट की दर पर ऋण उपलब्ध कराया जाए। इसके अलावा छोटे-छोटे उद्योगों में एक्साइज ड्यूटी में भी छूट देने की आवश्यकता है। मैं सरकार का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाह रहा हूँ कि हाथ से बने साबुन हैंड मेड सोप, जिनको बनाने में मशीनों का उपयोग नहीं होता है, गांव-गांव में हजारों की संख्या में ये कारखाने हैं जिनमें लाखों लोगों को रोजगार मिलता है और इन साबुन का उपयोग देश का सबसे गरीब तबका करता है, उन साबुन पर सरकार ने 16 परसेंट एक्साइज ड्यूटी लगाई है। इन छोटे-छोटे उद्योगों को आज देश में बड़ी बड़ी मल्टीनेशनल कम्पनियों के साथ प्रतियोगिता करनी पड़ रही है और आज हम चाहेंगे कि इस प्रकार के उद्योग जिसमें अधिक से अधिक लोगों को रोजगार मिल रहा है, इन उद्योगों को एक्साइज ड्यूटी से छूट मिलनी चाहिए, जिससे कि ये उद्योग इन मल्टीनेशनल कम्पनियों का मुकाबला कर सकें। महोदय, मैं सरकार का ध्यान इन छोटे-छोटे उद्योगों को एक्साइज ड्यूटी पर छूट देने के लिए अनुरोध करता हूँ।

महोदय, मैं सरकार का ध्यान आज की इन आर्थिक परिस्थितियों पर दिलाना चाहता हूँ। देश की आर्थिक स्थिति बहुत ही कमजोर है और जो विकास हो रहा है जिसका लाभ लोगों तक नहीं पहुंच रहा है और विशेषकर कृषि क्षेत्र में आज बहुत लोग त्रस्त हैं। आम आदमी त्रस्त है और मैं आशा करूंगा कि सरकार आने वाले दिनों में इन विषयों पर विचार करेगी, आने वाले बजट में इन बातों पर गौर करेगी तथा देश के जो सबसे कमजोर वर्ग का तबका है, जो सबसे नीचे के पायदान में आदमी खड़ा है विकास का लाभ उस आदमी तक कैसे पहुंचेगा, इसके बारे में चिंता करेगी, न कि सरकार केवल बड़े-बड़े उद्योगपतियों, मल्टीमिलियनर्स, मल्टीबिलियनर्स को लाभ पहुंचेगा। इस प्रकार की आर्थिक व्यवस्था करेगी। मैं और अधिक न कहते हुए सरकार को इतनी बात कहूंगा कि आने वाले दिनों में सरकार आम आदमी की बात करे, आम आदमी की विकास को लाभ मिले, इसके बारे में चिंता करे, इतनी बात करते हुए मैं अपनी बात को समाप्त करता हूँ। धन्यवाद।

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the appropriation No. 5 Bill and the Appropriation No. 6 Bill. I wish my hon. colleague could have said whether he supports these Bills or not. He has said everything, but neither did he oppose the Bills nor did he support the Bills.

श्री सुरेन्द्र लाठ: हमने कभी विरोध नहीं किया है। मेरे भाषण में मैंने विरोध नहीं किया है, और इसका मतलब यही होता है ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री संतोष बागड़ोदिया: मैं आपसे रिक्वेस्ट करता हूँ कि आपकी किसी बात में मैंने बाधा नहीं डाली। आप प्लीज शांति से सुन लीजिए। अब हम लोग सारी बात तो एक सी एक दूसरे की बोलेंगे नहीं और अगर हम लोग विरोध ही नहीं करेंगे तो फिर हम यहां बैठेंगे क्यों? इसलिए अपने जो भी जिराथ किया, वह आपका अधिकार था। Sir, before I come to the main subject of supplementary demands, I fully support hon. Lath's suggestions in regard to the small scale industry. But that is not the subject matter today. I will not go into the details of the issue, except the issue which relates to the Finance Ministry. The hon. Member has mentioned about closure of units due to finance problems. I would like to inform the hon. Member that from 1998 to 2004, till the NDA Government was there, the total loan to the small scale industry was 17 per cent of the total credit. I am not going to waste your time by giving figures of all the years. I do have these figures. I want to tell you that in these six years, from 1998 to 2004, when the NDA Government was ruling the country, what they had done for the SSI was, they had reduced the percentage from 17.5 per cent to 9 per cent. These are all statistics which are known to you, but you do not want to

mention them. Not only the percentage has gone down. Similarly, the number of units, which were supported by banks, was 32 lakhs and in 2004, they came down to 16 lakhs. My friend from the same group of people says that you have to look after the SSI. They asked, "What has the hon. Minister done? what has the UPA Government done for the SSI?" After this Government has come to power, the first thing that the hon. Minister has done is, he has made a statement in the House that in totality, every PSU bank will give 20 per cent more funding on the total amount. Supposing, it is Rs. 100 crores by one bank, it will be Rs. 120 crores next year. It will be increased every year. That is what has happened. The result is, in 2005, instead of 16 lakhs, 16.74 lakh units got credit. This year, the number has increased to 17.5 lakhs. This is what the Finance Ministry has already done. I fully agree that the general credit is going up by 30 per cent and the total percentage of credit is definitely going down. For that I have been approaching the hon. Finance Minister continuously. It is become more credit has gone to the service sector.

**SHRI SURENDRA LATH:** That is what I have said.

**SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA:** I request you not to interrupt.

**SHRI SURENDRA LATH:** I am saying this because you have quoted me.

**SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA:** I have quoted you because you spoke before me. I am not quoting him from out of the wind. मैं हवा में नहीं बोल रहा हूँ। मैंने यह भी क्वोट किया कि मैं आपकी सारी डिमांड्स को सपोर्ट करता हूँ। Sir, when he also mentioned about micro finance, I am telling you from experience that Self-Help Groups are a boon to the country. There is 100 per cent recovery. There is no NPA from Self-Help Groups. Let us not unnecessarily oppose every policy of the Government, even if it is helping the smallest people, the poorest people. He says, आम आदमी के लिए कुछ नहीं करते हैं। आम आदमी की व्यवस्था के लिए सेल्फ हेल्प ग्रुप को हेल्प करना चालू किया और मैं पूरे हिंदुस्तान में घूमकर यह बता सकता हूँ, गांव-गांव में घूमकर यह बता सकता हूँ कि लोगों को बहुत खुशी हुई है। छोटे-छोटे आदमियों को, सब्जी बेचने वाले को, सौ रुपया सुबह लोन में ले जाता है और शाम को मनी लेंडर को एक सौ दस रुपया देता है। इसके रेट क्या आप कैलकुलेट कर सकते हैं कि किस तरह का इंटरेस्ट रेट देना पड़ता है? दिन भर में सौ रुपए का एक सौ दस रुपए मनी लेंडर को देना पड़ता है



और वहीं आदमी जब सेल्फ हेल्प ग्रुप के पास जाता है, तो उसको बैंक इंटेरेस्ट में मिलता है। अगर इनके पास कोई खबर है कि ये सेल्फ हेल्प ग्रुप वाले कोई गड़बड़ कर रहे हैं तो ये खबर इनको भी दें और हम लोगों की भी बताएं कि कौन-सा स्पेसिफिक ग्रुप गड़बड़ कर रहा है? ... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI SURENDRA LATH: I am talking about NGOs.

श्री संतोष बागड़ोदिया: सेल्फ हेल्प ग्रुप ही एन॰जी॰ओ॰ होते हैं। एन॰जी॰ओ॰ और कुछ नहीं हैं। सेल्फ हेल्प ग्रुप को ही एन॰जी॰ओ॰ कहते हैं? उसके अलावा कोई एन॰जी॰ओ॰ हो, तो वह भी बता देना। इसके अलावा मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि

This is a great boon to them. Let us not oppose it for the sake of opposition, and if by chance, the hon. Minister decides to change the policy because you are opposing it, then, it will hurt lakhs and lakhs of small people in the villages. I request you to listen to him on this issue. माया सिंह जी ने यह ईश्यू रेज़ किया और यह बात आगे बढ़ी नहीं। मैं सोचता हूँ कि आप एलाउ करेंगे, चेरमैन साहब एलाउ करेंगे, तो यह डिस्कशन फिर चालू होगा, लेकिन केवल इतनी बात बताना चाहता हूँ कि

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN) You address the Chair.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA: This is the last point which I have to mention with reference to what he has spoken. I have to mention them because he is talking things which are not relevant. He mentioned about *mehangai*. We have talked about this *mehangai*; we have this price rise for discussion. In fact, it was only partially discussed. With the kind of growth of GDP, in two years' time, since the UPA Government has come into power, inflation is only 5 per cent. The growth rate was only half of it, but the growth now is 8 per cent, 9 per cent and 10 per cent. When the growth rate was three per cent or four per cent, the inflation was more than 5 per cent. The average inflation between 1998-2004 was 5.35 per cent of something like that.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: I will give the figures; you go ahead.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA: The hon. Minister says that he would give the figures. He will give the detailed figures. He is worried that if I give all the information, what will he give? Don't worry, Mr. Minister, you have much more intelligence, much more information, than me, and you can articulate much better things. But since I am standing, I have to also speak something. I am only defending you.

Sir, now, I come to the Supplementary Demands. Mr. Minister, when we talk of Supplementary Demands, this has come for the second time this year itself. I think it has become a practice of all the Finance Ministers year after year that they bring Supplementary Demands every year. I don't know if this kind of planning gives a good image to the Finance Ministry. Whoever is doing it, whichever Government is doing it, why should we have Supplementary Demands? This year too we have come with it twice. We brought it once in the Monsoon Session and we have come again, in this Session. Every year there are two Supplementary Demands.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Every year, there are three Supplementary Demands.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA: that is what I am saying why do you want to have Supplementary Demands? You have presented a Budget; it is for one year; it is not for ten years. If we cannot predict for one year, what is the point? I can understand if there is a calamity or there is some big change in the situation in the country and we need Supplementary Demands. I will go into the details of Demands also. But, with your transparency, Sir, if we can have even a five-year Budget, and then we have Supplementary Demands, I can understand that. But I do not understand, having an Annual Budget, and still bringing forward Supplementary Demands. I was just wondering if our wives started giving us their supplementary demands every three months, what would happen to us. We will be doomed. Sir, I was also wondering, Sir, whether this was a good and healthy practice or not. It has been observed that the budgetary allocations remain uncommitted and still the Supplementary Demands are sought in every Session. I would, therefore, demand that Supplementary Demands must be accompanied with a Ministry-wise statement of utilisation of budgetary grants. We will support you, Sir, but let me tell you we really do not have much information. We will support you because we are your strong followers. In this respect, may I also refer to a study conducted by a Washington-based Centre for Budget and Policy Priorities, with inputs from an Indian study group, Centre for Budget and

Governance Analysis, New Delhi? This study has developed an Open Budget Index to assess the transparency, quantity and quality of Information provided in Government's Budget Documents. And India is placed 17th, with a score of 52 per cent on the Index, meaning thereby, while Government does share some information. Yet the Budget is still not comprehensible to all. So, you can say, with more information we can probably do better. I urge upon the hon. Minister to look into the report and also examine its recommendations, if you think they are worthwhile, and to also assess the Budget layouts of other countries that have performed better than us on these indices.

Sir, I would like to submit that, like the Annual Demands for Grants, the Supplementary Demands should be examined by Department Related Parliamentary Committees, against the Annual Outcome Budgets. I also recommend that Supplementary Demands and Outcome Budgets too should be posted on the Finance Ministry's website. If these are already posted, well and good. If not, please put them on the website.

Sir, the hon. Minister mentioned about the Supplementary Demands of Rs. 21000 crores. He also mentioned about some ten thousand crores or so, which has been balanced, and the figure is Rs. 11,000 crores. Statistically, this is right. But if this demand of Rs. 21,000 crores had not been there, this ten thousand crores which he has balanced, probably, would have been used somewhere else. It would have been balanced somewhere else. So, I do not know, how far this balancing is right because, at the moment, we are talking only of Demands, not of resources. The demand is Rs. 21,000 crores. Let us not misunderstand the whole thing. The demand for Rs. 21,000 crores remains the same. How it is adjusted is a separate issue. You will adjust this ten thousand crores also. But it does not mean that the demand becomes zero. The demand remains the same.

Now, Sir, if you look at these demands, out of Rs. 21,800 crores, only Rs. 1360 crores are meant for capital expenditure. The remaining

amount is for revenue expenditure. I do not think it is a very healthy practice. Sir, I would like to draw the attention, through you, Sir, of the hon. Minister, to this chart which has been given in the Bill; it mentions 'Atomic energy', 192 crores. For Nuclear Power Schemes, under there revenue expenditure, there is a provision of Rs. 116 crores. But, the capital expenditure for the Nuclear Power Scheme is only Rs. 1,00,000 means Rs. 1 lakh. I don't know what is this capital expenditure of Rs. 1 lakh. Similarly, Sir, there is the Department of Fertilisers,—I think, probably, it may be the revenue expenditure for subsidy—there is a provision of Rs. 1,400 crores. I think, we can plan this subsidy in the beginning of the year, in a much better way. My suggestion is, no Supplementary Demands should be required for meeting the expenditure on subsidies. We all know that the hon. Minister has been very successful in augmenting the resources, but that does not mean that we spend it. Resource augmentation is good, but we have to save that, we have to use it somewhere else, or, at least, it should be used for such expenses which can be planned at the beginning of the year. It should have been planned at that time.

Similarly, Sir, for the Ministry of Coal, there is a provision of Rs. 131 crores for revenue expenditure. I can't understand why this kind of revenue expenditure should be demanded now, and not at the beginning of the year. Sir, for the Ministry of Defence, there is a provision of Rs. 64 crores for revenue expenditure, and for capital expenditure, it is only Rs. 4.96 crores. These are all figures given by the hon. Minister himself. I can go ahead with all these things, but I would not go into more details. But the fact remains that out of so much expenditure, Rs. 1360 crores is only for capital expenditure, and the balance of about Rs. 20,000 crores is for revenue expenditure. It has to be seen whether it is a healthy practice.

Sir, another thing that comes to my mind is, the details of Rs. 249 crores that are being charged on the Consolidated Fund of India. Sir, the Supplementary Demands of the Ministries like Commerce, Posts, Food and Public Distribution, Environment & Forests are being charged on the Consolidated Fund of India and not voted by the Parliament. If you charge

this on the Consolidated Fund of India, then, it is not voted by Parliament. What do you mean by charging it on the Consolidated Fund of India? Why don't we vote it in Parliament? The funds meant for these Ministries should be voted by the Parliament. It is not a very secret account, like the Department of Space. I am not questioning that. If that had been debited to the Consolidated Fund of India, I would have no problem. Similarly, capital outlay on Defence services is Rs. 49 crores. I won't question that because that can be due to various reasons. But, as far as expenditures of other Ministries are concerned, I wish it would not have gone to the Consolidated Fund of India, but it should have been voted by the Parliament. Further, Sir, a sum of Rs. 195 crores of the revenue expenditure is being granted in this Supplementary Demands as a charged expenditure and not to be voted by Parliament. That also doesn't look very logical from my point of view. But, I am sure, the hon. Minister will make it logical when he replies to the debate.

Sir, I want to know from the hon. Finance Minister whether it is true that certain State Governments,—because the State Governments are going to get Rs. 4,131 crores—have diverted the Central Government grants and assistance into their public accounts, thereby avoiding the legislative scrutiny by their own Legislative Assemblies. What steps are being taken by the Centre to check such tendencies? Sir, what is happening is this. There is no accountability for these kinds of funds. If the hon. Minister can explain it, then, I will really be obliged, and I will appreciate it.

Sir, just before this, the discussion was going on on the Prevention of Child Marriage Bill. For that, I would just like to give one figure. I don't want to discuss it in detail. Sir, the unemployment rate for females is found to be much higher than that for males in urban areas. That is the reason for child marriage. The unemployment rate for females is much higher. If that can be looked into by different policies, it will be a great help. Now, Sir, time comes for congratulating our Minister. I congratulate him for augmenting the resources which is unprecedented. Unprecedented, because it is just by not collecting more funds in every sector, whether it is income tax or excise duty and all services, but also widening the net, more assesseees. So I must fully support him and fully congratulate him for this. I would only like to tell him 2-3 things on this. One is, on the withdrawal tax. Withdrawal tax, the hon. Minister has mentioned in his Budget Speech that it is for trailing. It is not augmentation of revenue. It is

basically trailing the black money. I request him to share this information. In his experience of one and a half years or nearly more than 20 months, what kind of trailing has been done? How many people have been caught? If there are two or three or four or five, is it really worthwhile because this has become very cumbersome particularly in the villages where small, small people are suffering? The bankers are themselves suffering. So, please either justify this or as already assured, indirectly or directly, in the next Budget, withdraw this tax. Similarly FBT, the Fringe Benefit Tax, if it is for augmentation of revenue, I am with you, but if the same revenue can be augmented by taxing the same corporate in a different manner it will be a great help because most of the people are very unhappy about this kind of tax. It is a very unpopular tax. Tax is in any case unpopular, but this particular tax is very unpopular. Therefore, the hon. Minister may consider this aspect also. Next I come to the point on litigation. Sir, what is happening? There are thousands of cases pending in Supreme Court, High Court, Lower courts in appeals not because the assessee is going for these appeals. It is because the Department is going for appeals against its own decision. It is the Department's assessment done at the lowest level, which is wrong, considered wrong by, assesses. He goes to the higher authority, that is, the Commissioner and the Commissioner gives assessment in favour of assesses. The department does not accept it. Department does not believe their own officers. They go to the appellate authority. Even the appellate authority has got one of the officers sitting in the bench from their department and still the decision of the appellate authority is also not accepted by the Government. They go to the High Court. They go to the Supreme Court. The result is, forget about how much cost it has incurred by paying to different legal luminaries in the country, but how much time is wasted, how much harassment is done to the ordinary assessee by not trusting their own people! I request the hon. Minister to look into this aspect. Let us not file the cases for the sake of filing like largely opposing for the sake of opposing.

श्री रूदनारायण पाणि (उड़ीसा): बागडोदिया जी, ऐसा नहीं है, not opposition for opposition sake.

श्री संतोष बागडोदिया: पाणि जी, मैं आपसे हाथ जोड़ कर कहता हूँ कि मैंने आपका नाम नहीं लिया है।

श्री सुरेश भारद्वाज (हिमाचल प्रदेश): जब आपने opposition बोल दिया, तो पाणि जी खड़े हो गए।

श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो० पी०जे० कुरियन): मि० पाणि, आप बैठिए। Mr. Pany you need not explain.

प्रो० राम देव भंडारी (बिहार): वे नाम नहीं ले रहे थे, इसलिए वे खड़े हो गए कि उनका नाम लें।

श्री संतोष बागड़ोदिया: पाणि जी, मैंने लाठ जी का नाम इसलिए लिया कि उनका नाम रोशन हो, आप उनका नाम रोशन क्यों नहीं होने देते। Like this, litigations should be reduced, at least by the Government. I can understand ordinary citizens going there. But why does the Government go in for litigations one after the other. Another point that I would like to make on this issue is, please make a study how many cases the Government has taken to the High Court and the Supreme Court; and, how many decisions have been taken, by these authorities, in favour of the Government. That is only miniscule, a small percentage. That will show that the first decision taken by the original officer was wrong, and further decision to go to the court, without any reasonable basis was also wrong. Should be burden our Judiciary with this kind of attitude of the Executive? That aspect has to be seen. How many man-hours are we wasting in this kind of litigation?

The economic situation, as per the hon. Member, is definitely very good. Nobody can question that. He himself has said, "That economic situation is good, but it has not reached the *aam aadmi*." It is just not possible. If the economic situation is good, it has got to percolate to the *aam aadmi*. But, maybe it is not percolating with the same speed, as desired. But let it happen. If there is growth in the country, things will improve. Who will say that the roads, which are made all over the country, are meant only for the rich? Are they meant only for the individuals? They are meant for everybody. Does this facility not go to the *aam aadmi*. It does go to the *aam aadmi*. Does the Employment Guarantee Scheme not go to the *aam aadmi*? It is meant only for the *aam aadmi*. Two hundred districts are covered by it. It requires resources. The Government has provided resources. The primary schools are for the *aam aadmi*, for the villages. The Primary Health Centres are for the *aam aadmi*. I can go on counting such things. I am not going into those details because that is not

the subject matter of discussion, today. The growth, generally speaking, is very good. The hon. Prime Minister recently said, "Now, we can dare for the GDP growth of 14 per cent." The GDP growth of 14 per cent in two years! Had the NDA even thought, even in their dreams, of 14 per cent GDP growth? No! Our Prime Minister, our Finance Minister not only dream of it, but they are planning for it. And, this growth will not only go to the rich, but will definitely percolate to the poorest of the poor. *(Interruptions)* Sir, this fact has been recognized by the World Competitive Year Book, 2006 also. On the Competitive Index, based on 300 economic criteria, India jumped from the 50 position to the 29 in 2006. This has happened in just two years! This is not a mean achievement. It has been recognized that India has got resilience to withstand the economic cycles that occur in liberating economies. This has been confirmed by the world leaders, independent world leaders, not by our Government. India ranks 15th in the Asia pacific region, 10th in the thirty economies, with population more than 20 million, and 5th in twenty-five economies with per capital GDP less than 10,000 dollars. These are not mean achievements in two years. I request all of you to support him so that there can be more growth. We should support him, the entire House should support him for his economic policies so that was can go wholeheartedly and more and more effective growth can take place. That will go to the *aam admi*, let us not worry about it. In that case, of course, the agricultural sector is not developing as much as it should develop. I think, for this also, the entire responsibility is of the NDA because in agriculture, gestation period is very long. Development in that cannot take place in one or two years. Whatever our Governments did before 1998 or before 1996, they have spoiled that during their period. The result is that there is shortage of food. The result is that production in agriculture has gone down. But, now, when this Government has come, they are making new policies and taking new policy initiatives. I am sure, we will have a second Green Revolution very shortly, and you will find that India will again have surplus food despite increase in demand and increase in per capita consumption. This is what this Government is going to achieve.

The latest NSSO Survey poses an alarming picture though. The rate of unemployment is much higher among educated youth compared to those with low level of education. These figures do not augur well for an economy targeting to peg at a double-digit growth rate in the years to



come. This is only a warning to the hon. Minister. These are sectors of low and slow returns on massive investment. The Government will have to lead the way and make investments lucrative. Whatever may be the investments, Sir, and whoever has got the money, whether he has got Rs. 1 lakh, Rs. 2 lakhs, one billion or one million, he would like to invest in what is lucrative. The Government has to find methods to see that not only the Government investment is lucrative, but investments of ordinary citizens are also lucrative.

Sir, we can discuss this point. It is not a budget discussion. I just want to request the hon. Minister to kindly see once more whether—he himself has agreed that every year the supplementary demands come—these kinds of situations can be reduced. Particularly, he can have better and bigger vision so that we do not need to have supplementary demands. This will help in augmenting the economy better. Then, every citizen can also know that this extra expenditure will not be made by the Government. With these words, I once again support the Bill. Thank you very much, Sir.

DR. K. MALAISAMY (Tamil Nadu): Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman Sir, for permitting me to speak on this subject on behalf of the AIADMK, namely, the Second Supplementary Demands for Grants. After listening to the earlier speakers, Mr. Surendra Lath, followed by Mr. Santosh Bagrodia, I feel that my task has been made fairly easier in as much as they have covered a number of points which I wanted to appeal to the Chair. With the result, I will be as quickly as possible and as briefly as possible, and will try to balance a lengthy speech made by Mr. Santosh Bagrodia by a short one.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): It is good that you will not repeat the points.

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Sir, I will touch the points very briefly. I will underline a few points which I feel are significant and should be brought to the notice of our hon. Minister. Sir, we have been listening to the hon. Minister, who has been nice enough to tell what for he has come, how he is going to ask for and seek the sanction of this Parliament for an additional expenditure of Rs. 21,823 crores out of which Rs. 11,444 crores is the net cash outflow. Whereas he said that the balance of Rs. 10,378 crores could be made up by way of enhanced receipts, recoveries and savings, etc. We were able to listen to him. Sir, we have understood what the object of the Budget is. The Budget is a tool of administration and the basis of orderly finance. It is a powerful instrument of social and economic

policies. Not only that, it helps a lot, particularly, in a State like our welfare State, in promoting the welfare measures under the Budget. Sir, as a student of management, I had been taught as to what was meant by satisfactory service. Satisfactory service means and includes continuous service, timely service, adequate service and equitable service. This is the object with which a comprehensive Budget should be made. These are the backgrounds under which main Budget is prepared, followed by the supplementary demands. Sir, Now, with this background, the non object of the Budget should be to eliminate poverty, to eliminate unemployment, under-employment and to eliminate inequality in the distribution of wealth, status and so many things. Not only that, the Budget should ensure happiness, comfort, and everything to the people. This is the totality of the object of the Budget. While so, I am inclined to ask whether that object has been achieved, either through your main Budget or through your second Supplementary Budget. This is my core question, which I would like to ask. Shri Santosh Bagrodia highlighted what all had been done. On the other opposite side, they were pulling down all. Sir, as far as I am concerned. I am neither here nor there; I am in between. This is the stand I have taken. In other words, what are the best aspects, I am willing to appreciate. As such there are highlights and grey sides. As far as the hon. Minister is concerned, by virtue of his word power, and vocabular, he may be able to articulate and justify what are the things that are highlighted.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Not only that, he has got the knack of telling things as if it is real when things really do not exist. Even imaginary things can be nicely explained by him, as if they are in existence. ...*(Interruptions)*. Sir, as far as the physical achievements are concerned, the object of the Government is to eliminate poverty. I am inclined to ask the hon. Minister what is the totality of poverty in the country and how much has been reduced. Now, according to the figures available with us, still, about 38 per cent of the total population is under Below Poverty Line. Below Poverty Line itself is more than 38 per cent. Independence has been there for decades and decades. It is very unfortunate that as opined by many of the people the poor are becoming poorer and the rich people are becoming richer. In that situation, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether you are eliminating poverty, whether you are enriching the poor, it is not so. On the

other hand, if I go with Shri Santosh Bagrodia, the totality of the GDP growth is good. I have got a pat on the back for that. On the other hand, I would like to know whether you are able to reduce the fiscal deficit. No; it is not at all encouraging. So, there is one plus point and one minus point. Now, coming back to my point, whether the problem of unemployment has been solved; no. It has been increasing day by day. So, poverty has not been eliminated, the problem of unemployment has not been solved; and these are the major problems. Coming to the farmers, the prices are rising and we have come across umpteen number of cases throughout the length and breadth of the country of farmers committing suicide. You cannot deny that. Sir, the hon. Minister may try to say that we have simplified the procedure, we have provided loans for fertilizers and so on. All these things will be highlighted, but the fact remains, and the ground reality is, that it does not reach the farmer. What is wrong with the system? Is it the failure of the system or human failure? I am not going into those details at all. Your intentions may be good, but somehow or the other, it does not reach the poor. This is the way I look at it.

Sir, coming to some of the other area, as far as fiscal deficit is concerned, we see that the Non-Plan expenditure, the Revenue Expenditure and the Government expenditure are going upwards. Now, the bureaucracy has an understanding with the Ministry; they have got the knack of converting the non-Revenue Expenditure into capital expenditure when the non-Plan expenditure is going up. I don't know whether this kind of exercise is adopted in the Central Government or it is done in the State Government.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: That can't be done in the Government of India.

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Sir, coming to public sector undertakings, in the banks, you are trying to reduce the shareholding in the name of private participation. With your objective of disinvestment and encouraging private participation, or bringing them under a joint sector, or whatever it is, you have taken a stand and you are making an attempt in that direction. But I would like to ask, how far you have gone on your philosophy, of ideology. To what extent have you succeeded? That is the first point. At the same time, India being a welfare State, will this policy not be running counter to that principle? I would like to ask whether you are still in favour of the welfare State principles you go ahead with the present policy. (*Time-bell*)

5.00 P.M.

which your Left Front the Communist friends may not wish, to go with your disinvestment and privatisation attempt.

**SHRI V NARAYANASAMY:** Are they not your friends?

**DR. D. MALAISAMY:** They are your political friends. They may be your allies but on certain aspects they are not.

Sir, coming to Plan outlay, you have made allocations. But we find that in the field of education, health, rural development, rural housing, etc. either allocations are not made at all, or, even if they are made, they are inadequate. I would like to know what are your priorities. When you set priorities do you go by the proper norms or not?

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Dr. Malaisamy, please conclude...*(Interruption)*... You are not listening to me. You need to conclude...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Pany, sometimes you may speak. They have been allotted one-and-a-half hours' time. Now they have got ten minutes. What can I do? It is on the basis of parties

**DR. K. MALAISAMY:** Sir, a number of people have not spoken.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** That is not the case. Please conclude. This is an Appropriation Bill. We are not conducting a total debate on this...*(Interruptions)*....

**DR. K. MALAISAMY:** Now, that is the problem

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** No, it is not. Just a minute, Dr. Malaisamy. Now, it is 5 o'clock. There is also Half-an-Hour Discussion. I would like to take the sense of the House as to whether we could dispense with the Half-an-Hour Discussion and continue with the debate

**SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM:** Sir, we shall conclude the debate.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** That is what I am saying.

**SHRI MATILAL SARKAR (Tripura):** Sir, I shall need five to ten minutes.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** That is not possible, Mr. Sarkar, because otherwise we will not be able to complete. So, the sense of the House is that we shall continue with the debate and conclude it. The Minister, Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar, could lay his papers.

[14 December, 2006]

RAJYA SABHA

THE MINISTER OF PANCHAYATI RAJ, MINISTER OF YOUTH AFFAIRS AND SPORTS AND THE MINISTER OF DEVELOPMENT OF NORTH EASTERN REGION (SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR): Sir, I am a servant of the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, you may lay your papers.

---

**STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS—Contd.**

**STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS  
CONTAINED IN THE HUNDRED AND TWENTIETH REPORT  
OF DEPARTMENT-RELATED PARLIAMENTARY STANDING  
COMMITTEE ON HOME AFFAIRS**

THE MINISTER OF PANCHAYATI RAJ, MINISTER OF YOUTH AFFAIRS AND SPORTS AND THE MINISTER OF DEVELOPMENT OF NORTH EASTERN REGION (SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR): Sir, I beg to lay a statement on the status of implementation of recommendations contained in the Hundred and twentieth Report of the Department-related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Home Affairs

---

**GOVERNMENT BILLS—Contd.**

**THE APPROPRIATION (No. 5) BILL, 2006**

**AND**

**THE APPROPRIATION (NO.6) BILL, 2006. —Contd.**

DR. K. MALAISAMY: Sir, I am told that the national banks are not faring well and they are able to survive because of the Budget support given by this Government. When the national banks are not faring well, what are you going to do? What is the package that you are likely to give to such banks to solve their hurdle or problems? Again, I am told that you are getting the maximum revenue, around 54 or 58 per cent of the total